

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated April 14, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 as being grammatically incorrect on lines 18-19. The Examiner rejected Claims 7 - 13 as including a "first security chamber riser" that was not enabled by the description in the specification. Claims 1 - 13 were rejected because they contained limitations that did not have proper antecedent bases.


In response, Applicant has changed the grammatical mistake in Claim 1, has removed the non-enabled limitation in Claim 7 and has provided antecedent basis for the limitations in Claims 1 and 7 pointed out by the Examiner. The Examiner stated that if these corrections were made, the application would be in condition for allowance.

It is believed that the foregoing is fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. It is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted

HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN

Customer No. 24,118  
Phone No. 918-587-2000

By:   
Allen F. Bennett, Reg. No. 50,199  
228 West 17th Place  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119  
Attorneys for Applicant